



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/369,543	08/06/1999	STEPHEN TEMPLE	27754/35856	6919

7590 03/26/2002

JAMES P ZELLER
MARSHALL O'TOOLE GERSTEIN MURRAY & BORUN
6300 SEARS TOWER
233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO, IL 606066402

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, THINH H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2861

DATE MAILED: 03/26/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/369,543

Applicant(s)

TEMPLE, STEPHEN

Examiner

Thinh H Nguyen

Art Unit

2861

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo. (JP 4-10948) in view of Kneezel. (U.S. 5,598,191)

Kondo (see figs. 2, 8) discloses the instant claimed color printhead and printing method wherein nozzles being arranged in blocks and repeat patterns so as to print different swath of colors each being wider than a swath printed by a single nozzle side by side or overlap swaths of different colors at any point by controlling the relative shuttle movement of the print head and the ink-receiving medium (see also constitution).

As for said printhead being greater than the receiving medium, Kondo suggests the printhead width can be extended to shorten the time for printing since there will be less distance for the carrier to shuttle along the shaft. It would have been an obvious expedience to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a wider printhead as suggested by Kondo thereby to enable a shorter printing time.

Even though Kondo does not exactly perform overlapped printing in registry with the previous printed swath (by one nozzle scanning at a time) in a further relative traverse printing further swaths, Kondo suggests moving the print head a distance slightly greater than one nozzle thereby to create overlapped printing almost in registry.

Kneezel (see the entire document for details) teaches the similar color nozzles arrangement including the step reciprocating the printhead (one nozzle distance) to print different color print swath and overlap swaths in registry therewith in further relative scanning of the printhead . In view of the Kneezel teachings, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the controlling steps as taught by Kneezel in Kondo's printhead for printing overlapped print swaths in registry with the previous printed swaths.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's response filed January 4, 2002 has been entered and carefully considered. However, arguments with respect to claims 1-40 are not deemed to be persuasive.

Applicant contends (page 5, par.3; page 6, par. 1, 2, 3) that Kondo failed to teach printing a single swath having a width greater than a width of a single nozzle element.

The Examiner disagreed with this contention. Kondo as claimed in claim 1 and 3, disclosed each of the nozzle units arranged in the row comprises 2 nozzles for each respective color. Therefore, it is clear in Kondo that the swath

width greater than one nozzle element can be printed using repeating nozzle units, and thus Kondo clearly suggested that arrangements (fig.2 and 8) can be combined.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually (i.e. Kneezel reference), one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In view of the foregoing reasons, the examiner asserts that all limitations have been properly evaluated and that the rejection as applied remains proper.

2. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Contact Information

Art Unit: 2861

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Thinh Nguyen at telephone number (703) 308-7487.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956



Thinh Nguyen

March 22, 2002

Thinh Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2800